

Application Serial No. 10/812,639
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-3673

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated July 25, 2008, the Examiner states that Claims 1-10 are pending and rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

Claim 4 is objected to because the Office Action considers that the phrase, "The mounting structure" lacks clarity and precision. Applicant has amended this phrase to read "A mounting structure" as suggested in the Office Action. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to Claim 4.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Segawa et al. (US 2002/0057468) for the reasons of record. Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segawa in view of Akimoto et al. (US 2002/0191103) for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Segawa only discloses that the spring electrode (15) is pressingly contacted with external connection end (8b). As such, Segawa does not teach or suggest that a contact member is configured to apply lateral force toward the electrode pad as in the rejected claims. Due to the presence of this feature, it is possible to eliminate the problem where upon applying some force to the compact camera module, the module may bounce out and detach from the socket. Since Segawa does not include this feature, it cannot eliminate the foregoing problem.

To support a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must establish "a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference." Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 72 Fed. Reg. 57,526 (Oct. 10, 2007). Moreover, as is well known, in order for a reference to anticipate a claim, it must disclose each and every element of that claim. Applicant respectfully asserts that a *prima facie* case of obviousness or anticipation has not been established since the cited prior art is silent with respect to the claimed element of a contact member that is configured to apply lateral force

10/24/2008 09:58 FAX 312 427 6663

LADAS & PARRY LLP

0007/0007

OCT 24 2008

Application Serial No. 10/812,639
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-3673

toward the electrode pad. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a).

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

October 24, 2008



Date

Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613